## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 10-13, 15-17, 31, and 63 are presently active.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 3, 4, 7, 10-14, and 31 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-19 in U.S. Pat. No. 6,700,058. Claims 15-17 and 63 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-19 in U.S. Pat. No. 6,700,058 in view of Nakamura.

In response, a terminal disclaimer is presently filed.

Consequently, in light of the submission of a terminal disclaimer, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Ronald A. Rudder, Ph. D. Registration No. 45,618

I:\atty\RAR\aMENDMENTS (2006)\282439US\RESPONSE-TO-OA04122006.doc